

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM No.M-39934 of 2016  
Date of decision: 01.02.2017**

Rano Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL**

**Present:** Mr. Rao Ajender Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Malik, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. S.S. Dinarpur, Advocate for the complainant.

**REKHA MITTAL J. (Oral)**

Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has already joined investigation in compliance with the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 17.11.2016. On completion of investigation, challan has been presented in the Court and the petitioner is ready to face the proceedings without any default in accordance with law.

Counsel for the State concedes to this position. However, counsel for the complainant has submitted that in view of seriousness of allegations against the petitioner, she is not entitled to anticipatory bail.

I have heard counsel for the parties, perused the paperbook and the records.

The petitioner was allowed interim bail by this Court on 17.11.2016 and on the said date, the complainant was being represented by Sh. S.S. Dinarpur, Advocate. Indisputably, the petitioner has already

joined investigation which led to filing of a report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. before the Court. In view of the above, interim bail granted to the petitioner is made absolute but subject to the conditions incorporated in the order dated 17.11.2016. However, allowing anticipatory bail to the petitioner would not cause prejudice to either of the parties during course of trial.

(REKHA MITTAL)  
JUDGE

01.02.2017  
*yakub*

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:        | Yes/No |